

Forest Sector Workgroup
PROPOSED METHODOLOGIES FOR USE OF MEETING TIME
Staff proposal ~ May 21, 2008

This document outlines proposed methodologies for three types of sessions that would occur during full workgroup meetings: (1) information sessions; (2) policy issue deliberations; and (3) project category design sessions. These are a work in progress. They are intended to assist the group by providing useful and predictable structure, and will be adapted as necessary.

Proposed Methodology: INFORMATION SESSIONS

1. Secure presentation from 2-3 member panel, including:
 - Knowledgeable presenter affiliated with environmental caucus
 - Knowledgeable presenter affiliated with industry caucus
 - Knowledgeable presenter(s) unaffiliated with a caucus
 - (if possible, use workgroup members or their technical support people)
2. Provide 30-45 minute panel presentation
3. Provide 10-15 minute Q&A
4. Provide 20-30 minute workgroup discussion
5. Assess degree of workgroup common understanding of the issue
 - If satisfactory level of common understanding, no further formal workgroup time commitment needed.
6. If unsatisfactory level of common understanding, assess specific points of uncertainty/disagreement and create an ad hoc subgroup of workgroup members and technical presenters and/or technical support people to work on those specific points in the interim between meetings and come back to next workgroup meeting to present conclusions.
7. Conclusions can be the basis for increased understanding and/or continuing areas of uncertainty/disagreement.
8. Final workgroup conclusions will be documented.

Potential Information Session Topics

1. Basic features of cap and trade offset systems
2. Land use regulation and market pressure for forest land conversion
3. Forest pools of carbon sequestration and storage, and silvicultural influences, including storage in harvested wood products
4. Forestry carbon protocols (from UW), including protocols for afforestation/reforestation
5. Substitution of forest products and biomass for more carbon-intensive building products and energy sources (time permitting)
6. Other (time permitting)

Proposed Methodology: POLICY ISSUE DELIBERATION

1. Co-conveners pose **critical issue questions** and circulate to workgroup members in advance. Members can suggest adjustments in questions.
2. "Caucus" representatives, alternating between caucuses, address the critical issue questions from their respective interests, to clarify areas of commonality and difference.
3. Allow for 2-4 rounds of comment, with facilitation (Approx. 30-45 minutes)
4. Provide for comments and observations from "non-affiliated" workgroup members (Approx. 10-15 minutes)
5. Provide general facilitated workgroup discussion to explore areas of and degree of critical agreement and disagreement on the issue, and work to expand areas of agreement where possible. (Approx. 20-30 minutes)
6. Assess workgroup agreement/disagreement on the issue.
 - If satisfactory level of agreement, no further workgroup commitment of time needed.
7. If unsatisfactory level of agreement, assess specific points of disagreement and create an ad hoc subgroup of workgroup members and invited others to work on those specific points in the interim between meetings, and come back to the next workgroup meeting to present conclusions.
8. Conclusions can address expanded areas of agreement and/or continuing disagreement.
9. Final workgroup conclusions will be documented.

Potential Policy Issue Topics

1. Legal rights to conversion and extension of emission cap to conversion.
2. Storage in harvested wood products qualifying as offsets.
3. Co-benefits – both ecological and economic
4. Product substitution (time permitting)
5. Other (time permitting)

Proposed Methodology: PROJECT CATEGORY DESIGN

1. Co-conveners and facilitator review areas of applicable “technical” understanding or uncertainty/disagreement, and areas of applicable policy issue agreement/disagreement.
2. Co-conveners and/or workgroup members present **straw proposals** for workgroup consideration. Straw proposals should include:
 - General features of the proposed project category
 - How the project category meets the standard parameters for carbon credits, including considerations of leakage and accounting.
 - A sense of the scale or extent of the project category.
 - A sense of linkage with other project categories and other policy tools outside carbon credit markets.
 - Other applicable features.
3. Workgroup has general facilitated discussion of the straw proposal(s), especially identifying:
 - Areas of agreement
 - Areas of uncertainty
 - Areas needing further development of detail
 - Areas of potential disagreement
 - Likelihood of the workgroup reaching a conclusion on the proposal(s)
4. Assess degree of workgroup conclusion on the proposal(s), and the need for additional work.
 - If necessary, create an ad hoc subgroup of workgroup members and invited others to work further on the proposal in the interim between meetings, and come back to the next workgroup meeting to present results.
5. Further workgroup discussion as needed, and further assessment of agreement.
6. Documentation of results for final workgroup consideration and approval.

Potential Project Categories

1. Avoided conversion
2. Commercial forest management, including harvested wood products
3. Urban afforestation
4. Substitution for more carbon-intensive building materials
5. Avoided emissions from fire and other natural disturbances
6. Biomass energy